



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/646,020 | 08/22/2003 | Thomas Soares | LON-002 | 9249 |
| 53830 | 7590 | 11/15/2007 | | |
| KOKKA & BACKUS, PC 200 PAGE MILL ROAD SUITE 103 PALO ALTO, CA 94306 | | | EXAMINER AHN, SANGWOO | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2166 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 11/15/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/646,020 | Applicant(s) SOARES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Sangwoo Ahn | Art Unit 2166 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 16 – 35 are pending in this Office Action.
Claims 1 – 15 have been canceled.
Applicant's amendments to the specification and drawings have been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. There is no argument presented in the Applicant's Remarks filed on 8/16/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 2003/0036925) in view of Chiang et al. (US 6381711).

■ Regarding claim 1, Miller teaches,

A process, comprising:

displaying an IT services catalog (Figure 6 element 602 and paragraph 85, et seq.),

presenting one or more options associated with the IT services catalog
(paragraph 36 lines 1 – 5, paragraphs 85 and 88, Figure 8, et seq.);

determining if an option is selected, the option indicating a request to provide
assistance with selecting one or more IT services from the IT services catalog
(paragraph 36 lines 1 – 5, paragraphs 85 and 88, Figure 8, et seq.);

identifying one or more service actions based upon one or more answers (Figure
6 element 603, et seq.)

filling in a field in a data structure based upon the one or more answers
(paragraph 98 lines 32 – 35, Figure 5 element 505, et seq.);

requesting input associated with one or more unpopulated fields associated with
the data structure, wherein the input is used to determine the one or more service
actions (Figure 4, et seq.); and

validating the input to configure one or more IT services associated with one or
more service actions (Figure 6 element 603, Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2
– 14, et seq.).

Miller does not explicitly disclose displaying a question if the request is detected,
wherein the question is evaluated using a decision tree, and traversing the decision tree
based upon one or more answers received in response to the question until one or
more service actions are determined.

However, Chiang discloses displaying a question if the request is detected,
wherein the question is evaluated using a decision tree (column 3 lines 3 – 6, et seq.),
and traversing the decision tree (column 3 line 4, et seq.) based upon one or more

Art Unit: 2166

answers received in response to the question until one or more service actions are determined (column 3 lines 4 – 10, et seq.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Miller with the teaching of Chiang, wherein the system of Miller would have incorporated the teachings of Chiang in order to allow a user to acquire assistance manually by the user when help is desired as suggested by Chiang (column 2 line 66 – column 3 line 1, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 17, Miller discloses validating the one or more answers using a constraint (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.), rejecting the one or more answers if the constraint is violated or the one or more answers are validated, and providing another question if the one or more answers are rejected (Figure 5 element 508, paragraph 73 lines 1 – 4, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 18, Miller discloses validating the one or more answers using a validation formula (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.), rejecting the one or more answers if the validation formula indicates the one or more answers are invalid, and providing another question if the one or more answers are rejected (Figure 5 element 508, paragraph 73 lines 1 – 4, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 19, Miller discloses the constraint is stored in one or more attributes of the data field in the data structure (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

■ Regarding claim 20, Miller discloses the constraint is stored in a service advisor, the service advisor being configured to provide assistance (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

■ Regarding claim 21, Miller discloses another field in the data structure is filled in automatically based upon the one or more answers (paragraph 98 lines 32 – 35, Figure 5 element 505, et seq.).

■ Regarding claim 22, Miller discloses a dialog box presenting a suggested default answer based upon configuration attribute data associated with each of the one or more unpopulated fields (Figure 4 element 402 – 432; 438 – 456, Figure 4, paragraph 38 lines 12 – 15, et seq.).

■ Regarding claim 23, Miller discloses,

A process, comprising:

displaying an IT services catalog comprising one or more IT services (Figure 6 element 602, paragraph 85, et seq.);

determining if a service action is selected to create an instance of the one or more IT services (paragraph 76 lines 8 – 13, paragraph 86 lines 1 – 3, et seq.);

validating one or more answers received in response to one or more questions (Figure 6 element 603, Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, et seq.);

identifying one or more IT services based upon the one or more answers (Figure 6 element 603, et seq.);

entering data into one of more fields of one or more data structures associated with the one or more IT services (paragraph 98 lines 32 – 35, Figure 5 element 505, et seq.); and

requesting input associated with one or more empty fields of the one or more data structures, wherein the one of more empty fields comprise relationship fields used to define the one or more IT services (Figure 4, et seq.).

Miller does not explicitly disclose launching a service advisor , wherein the advisor uses a decision tree if the service action is not selected, displaying one or more questions, wherein the one or more questions are presented according to the decision tree, the decision tree having one of more recommendations associated with the one or more IT services.

However, Chiang discloses disclose launching a service advisor, wherein the advisor uses a decision tree if the service action is not selected (column 2 lines 64 – 66, column 3 line 66 – column 4 lien 1, column 3 line 4, et seq.), displaying one or more questions (column 3 lines 3 – 6, et seq.), wherein the one or more questions are presented according to the decision tree, the decision tree having one of more recommendations associated with the one or more IT services (column 3 lines 4 – 10, et seq.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Miller with the teaching of Chiang as discussed above in the analysis of claim 16.

■ Regarding claims 24 – 26, Miller discloses the one or more empty fields are filled using a pointer to one or more service actions/IT resource, based upon the one or

Art Unit: 2166

more answers and the input (paragraph 46 lines 4 – 7; 9 – 13; 13 – 17, paragraph 98 lines 32 – 35, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 27, Miller discloses using a constraint stored in one or more attributes of the one or more fields of the one or more data structure (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 28, Miller discloses the constraint is a validation formula (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 29, Miller discloses using a constraint stored in the service advisor (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

Regarding claim 30, Miller discloses one or more dialog boxes (Figure 4 element 402 – 432; 438 – 456, Figure 4, paragraph 38 lines 12 – 15, et seq.).

- Regarding claim 31, Miller discloses one or more selectable icons associated with the one or more answers (Figure 4 element 402 – 432; 438 – 456, Figure 4, paragraph 38 lines 12 – 15, et seq.).

- Claims 32 – 34 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claims 16 and 23 rejections.

- Regarding claim 35, Miller discloses validating one or more answers (Figure 5 element 507, paragraph 53 lines 2 – 14, paragraph 33 lines 2 – 9; 16 – 19; 22 – 23, et seq.).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sangwoo Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Patent Examiner Sangwoo Ahn
AU 2166

11/8/2007 SW



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER